DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 839 PS 009 542

AUTHOR	Mays, Violet; And Others
TITLE	Selection of Children for the KEEP Demonstration School: Criteria, Procedures, and Results. Technical Report #13.
INSTITUTION	Kamehameha Schools, Honolulu, Hawaii. Kamehameha Early Education Project.
SPONS AGENCY	California Univ., Los Angeles. Mental Retardation Research Center.; Hawaii State Dept. of Education, Honolulu.
PUB DATE	[74]
NOTE	11p.; For related documents, see PS 009 533-541 and PS 009 543-573
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; *Demonstration Programs; Early Childhood Education; Educational Improvement; *Family School Relationship; Hawaiians; *School Registration; Selection; Socioeconomic Status; *Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	Hawaii; *Kamehameha Early Education Program

ABSTRACT

This brief report describes the selection of the pupil population of the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) Demonstration School. The pupil population must be representative of the Kalihi community (an urban area of Honolulu) from which it is drawn. An attempt was made to include 75% Hawaiian and 25 % Non-Hawaiian children, to select equal numbers of boys and girls, and to include 66.6% low and 33.3% middle income families. Selection procedures are described, and difficulties in recruitment are discussed. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED158839

Technical Reports

of

The Kamehameha Early Education Program

a research and development program established and funded by

The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate

Ronald Gallimore, Roland G. Tharp & Gisela E. Speidel,
General Editors

Ellen Antill
Production Editor

Technical Report #13

The cooperation of the State of Hawaii Department of Education is gratefully acknowledged, as is the support and resources made available by the Sociobehavioral Research Group, MRRC, University of California, Los Angeles.

PS 009542

The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position, policy or have the endorsement of The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate, or of the editors.

Published by The Kamehameha Early Education Project, 1850 Makuakane Street, Honolulu, HI 96817

All rights reserved. No parts of this report may be reproduced in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kim C. M. Sloat

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The Kamehameha Early Education Program

The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) is a research and development program of The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate. The mission of KEEP is the development, demonstration, and dissemination of methods for improving the education of Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian children. These activities are conducted at the Ka Na'i Pono Research and Demonstration School, and in public classrooms in cooperation with the State Department of Education. KEEP projects and activities involve many aspects of the educational process, including teacher training, curriculum development, and child motivation, language, and cognition. More detailed descriptions of KEEP's history and operations are presented in Technical Reports #1-4.

Abstract

The selection criteria for KEEP pupils are described. The overall goal of making the KEEP classrooms representative of Kalihi (urban area of Honolulu) public school children is achieved by a stratified sampling technique in which each class is composed of equal numbers of boys and girls; three-fourths of whom are Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, one-fourth non-Hawaiian; and two-thirds are from lower income families, one-third from middle-income families. Within each of these strata, sampling is random.

The selection procedures are described. The outcome, in terms of characteristics of children actually enrolled, compares favorably with the criteria.

Difficulties in recruitment are discussed. Socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the 1972-73 and 1973-74 families are presented in tabular form.

Technical Report #13

Selection of Children for the KEEP Demonstration School; Criteria, Procedures, and Results (1972-73 and 1973-74)

Violet Mays Steven Boggs Roland G. Tharp Ronald Gallimore

The selection procedures for children in the KEEP Demonstration School were guided by one basic consideration: the KEEP school must be representative of the overall Kalihi community of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians. The purpose of KEEP is to make educational discoveries which will have general applicability to this community, so selection procedures must be designed to insure that the KEEP pupils are typical of those in the DOE schools of Kalihi. Our classes should be representative samples in terms of abilities, family background, and cultural orientation.

In the late winter and spring of 1972, we adopted a technique of choosing in advance certain proportionate restrictions on the sample. Within each proportion, sampling was to be random. For instance, we decided in advance that the school should not be composed entirely of Hawaiian children. It is the Kamehameha Schools' mission to serve the Hawaiian child, but the KEEP classroom must be typical of the population conditions for the Hawaiian public school child in Kalihi. The social environment is ethnically mixed, therefore, we adopted the criterion that 25% of the students in a KEEP class should be non-Hawaiian.

We also chose the criterion that there should be an equal number of boys and girls.

Kalihi is considered one of Honolulu's poorer communities. Nevertheless,

the Kalihi population also includes many middle-income Hawaiian families. Our resources did not allow us to conduct a scientific survey of socioeconomic strata in Kalihi. We had to rely on local school observations and interviews with both Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian educators and community leaders for our estimates. Based on these estimates we determined that the children of our sample should be from lower income families as well as middle-income families in the approximate proportions of two to one.

We were convinced, then, that we would have a class of children representative of the Kalihi area, 75% of whom would be Hawaiian, 25% non-Hawaiian; half boys, half girls; and two -thirds from low income families, one-third from middle-income families.

Within this stratified system, however, no other selection bias should be present, that is, it should be random.

It remained, then, to find some device for choosing children which would meet the above criteria for a stratified random sample. KEEP considered several selection devices, but final plans were guided by availability of lists of Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian families from which we could select randomly. Aside from house-to-house canvassing, two sources were available that could be used to select KEEP classes. The first source was the Hawaii State Department of Social Services and Housing (DSSH) which agreed to supply a list of families living in Kalihi and receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The department would identify families with children eligible to attend kindergarten and separate them into Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian groups, thus forming two lists.

The second potential source was a list of unsuccessful Kalihi applicants to the Kamehameha Schools (KS) campus kindergarten program. Since these children would be considered only after their application had been declined by

the Admissions Office of the Schools, being considered for KEEP had no bearing one way or the other on entry into the Kapalama Campus program.

These lists seemed certain to contain families from different socio-economic levels. Thus, we met our criterion for socioeconomic composition by selecting two-thirds of our children from the two DSSH lists, and one-third from the unsuccessful Kamehameha Schools applicant list. From within these lists, names were drawn randomly. Some bias in the draw was used to insure sex equality. Drawn families were contacted, and KEEP was explained to them. This process continued until enough parents had "accepted" to fill the class.

We believe that the data reported here substantiate our view that these procedures met our essential criteria of representativeness. They have worked so well, that we retained them into 1974. Our "ideal" proportions vary slightly from year to year, and even within years, as some children move away from KEEP and others are drawn as replacements. The following data support the procedures. We compared the first year class (1972-73) in terms of the sub-sample from which they were drawn: DSSH or KS unsuccessful applicant. The analysis suggests that the source from which the children were taken strongly determines the socioeconomic status and other associated factors. KS applicant children come from families in which both father and mother have more education, are more likely to be employed, and employed in better jobs. Thus, we achieved the goal of social heterogeneity, and have represented a wide range of the Hawaiian populations in the class (see Appendix for tabular presentation of socioeconomic characteristics of the families of the 1972-73 and 1973-74 classes. Also see Technical Report #5 for information on entering kindergarten ability and achievement levels).

1972-73 Recruitment

The following are the results of our recruitment for the 1972-73 school year using the DSSH lists:

Non-Hawaiians -- 22 were contacted
7 accepted
15 declined

Hawaiian -- 20 were contacted
10 accepted (2 moved out of the area)
10 declined

Thus, in 1972-73, 64 percent of the non-Hawaiian families declined to participate. This extremely high decline rate suggests that the non-Hawaiian student group at KEEP is strongly influenced by self-selection factors.

With only eight children from the DSSH Hawaiian list and seven from the non-Hawaiian list, (and our time running out), we had to expand the number of students that we had planned to take from the Kamehameha Schools' unsuccessful applicants list from 8 to 13. There were two reasons for this. One was the time involved in contacting the DSSH families and waiting for notice of their interest. We had allowed insufficient lead time (this was corrected in later years). Another reason was the number of families who were not interested in this program, a problem that we had underestimated. We had to contact about three families from the non-Hawaiian list to get one child. Of the families from the Hawaiian list, five had to be contacted for every two acceptances.

There were 43 Kalihi children on the Kamehameha Schools' list of unsuccessful kindergarten applicants--22 boys and 21 girls. Eighteen of these families were found to be outside of the Kalihi school district area by the time we tried to contact them.

KS Unsuccessful Applicants:	Boys	Girls
	9 eligible 5 accepted 4 declined	16 eligible 8 accepted 6 declined 2 were not contacted since the class was filled as of October 12.

Combined totals: 23 KS applicant families contacted
13 accepted
10 declined

Final composition of the 1972-73 class: 28 children

	Boys	Girls
DSSH Hawaiian list: 8 children	4	4
DSSH non-Hawaiian list: 7 children	3	4
KS Unsuccessful Applicants: 13 children	5	8
Total: 28 children	12	16

1973-74 Recruitment

The 1973-73 recruitment process began in March, 1973, and ended on September 18, 1973, about one week after full-time classes had begun. During the time period of April, 1973 to September, 1973, 57 families were contacted. These families included 14 from the list of the unsuccessful kindergarten applicants to the Kamehameha Schools campus program. The following is a detailed breakdown of the recruitment:

DSSH lists:

Hawaiians -- 23 were contacted
13 accepted
10 declined (3 were ineligible by residence)

Non-Hawaiians -- 21 were contacted
7 accepted
14 declined

Efforts to get Hawaiian students from the DSSH lists were more successful than in our first year. We were able to get one child for every two families contacted. This is due, in part, to an earlier start on recruitment (April-May as opposed to June-July) so that families could begin to prepare their child for this different school experience. Parents could see a class in operation and the new building site. Two of the mothers stated that they were particularly influenced by a mother of a KEEP enrollee.

Recruitment of the non-Hawaiian children was the same as the previous year, with one child for three families contacted.

KS Unsuccessful Applicants:

14 families contacted
9 accepted
5 declined

All of the families of these children had heard about KEEP and were eager to enroll their children.

This was the breakdown of KEEP's second kindergarten class as of September 24, 1973:

	Boys	Girls
DSSH Hawaiian list; 12 children	9	3
DSSH Non-Hawaiian list: 7 children	1	6
KS Unsuccessful Applicants: 9 children	5	4
Total: 28 children	15	13

Conclusions

The selection system used at KEEP has some problems. Perhaps the most significant difficulty is the extremely high rate of refusals from non-Hawaiian families. In both 1972 and 1973, 67% of the non-Hawaiian families contacted either declined to enroll or never responded, in contrast to a conservative estimate of 48 and 37 percent decline/no response/not available rate for Hawaiian families. Interpretation of this differential is largely based on speculation since it is, of course, unreasonable to expect families who have declined to provide elaborate explanations. At least some of the families seem to feel that anything sponsored by the Kamehameha Schools is for Hawaiians only; if they do not identify themselves as Hawaiian, they do not wish to participate. Whether they feel that their children should not enjoy Hawaiian benefits, or do not wish their children to attend an "Hawaiian school" for other reasons is not clear.

During the second year we found that because KEEP was better known, recruitment was easier in the Kalihi area. Visits to the Demonstration School also helped: the one-way mirrors and video recording equipment did not alarm parents and the bright and happy school atmosphere was impressive.

KEEP has enrolled children with the wide range of abilities, backgrounds, and cultural orientations which seem typical of children of the Kalihi area.